



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/018,152

05/08/2002

Marian Trinkel

2345/171

8320

26646

7590

03/23/2009

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
ONE BROADWAY  
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

AHMED, SALMAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2419

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/23/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center"><b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	<p><b>Application No.</b> 10/018,152</p>	<p><b>Applicant(s)</b> TRINKEL ET AL.</p>	
	<p><b>Examiner</b> SALMAN AHMED</p>	<p><b>Art Unit</b> 2419</p>	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 13 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☒ The Notice of Appeal was filed on 3/13/2009. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Salman Ahmed/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2419

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments see pages 4-7 of the Remarks section, filed 3/13/2009, with respect to the rejections of the claims have been fully considered and are not persuasive.

Applicant argues (see page 5 paragraph 1) that the Cave reference in combination with the Evans reference as discussed above does not teach or describe the access provided via desktop control and status-display functions and call-related data in a dynamic interface of a web browser, and any functional scope of the functions and data being provided at least one web document stored on the web server wherein the at least one web document is a latest version available of the respective web document, as required by claim 7. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's assertion. Cave in view of Evans do indeed teach the cited limitations. Specifically, Cave teaches any access via at least one of a system-bound telephone (telephone, col. 3 lines 30-35) and internet telephone (telephone, col. 3 lines 30-35) is provided with desktop control and status-display functions and call-related data in a dynamic interface of a web browser (Fig. 2 ref. sign browser and respective portions of the spec.), any functional scope of the desktop control and status-display functions and the call-related data being provided and an application interface (graphical presentation, col. 7 lines 17-20) being defined by at least one web document (documents, col. 7 lines 11-15) stored on the web server (server 120, col. 7 lines 11-20). Cave does not explicitly teach at least one web document is a latest version available of the respective web document. Evans in the same field of endeavor teaches web server serving latest version of the document (page 1 section 0010).

1. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.
2. Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Applicant argues that (see page 5, paragraph 2) the Tsuboi reference does not teach or describe each and every element of claim 7 of the present invention, including a circuit arrangement including an intelligent telecommunications system having a connection to a public telephone network and being linked via an integration element, wherein the intelligent telecommunications system is connected to a local area network, an electronic data processing system being connected to the local area network, wherein the local area network is connected to a web server and wherein any access via at least one of a system-bound telephone and an internet telephone is provided with desktop control and status-display functions and call-related data in a dynamic interface of a web browser, any functional scope of the desktop control and status-display functions and the call-related data being provided and an application interface being defined by at least one web document stored on the web server, wherein the at least one web document is a latest version available of the respective web document.

3. Again, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

4. Furthermore, Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Applicant argues that (see page 5, paragraph 2) the Evans reference does not teach or describe each and every element of claim 7 of the present invention, including a circuit arrangement including an intelligent telecommunications system having a connection to a public telephone network and being linked via an integration element, wherein the intelligent telecommunications system is connected to a local area network, an electronic data processing system being connected to the local area network, wherein the local area network is connected to a web server and wherein any access via at least one of a system-bound telephone and an internet telephone is provided with desktop control and status-display functions and call-related data in a dynamic interface of a web browser, any functional scope of the desktop control and status-display functions and the call-related data being provided and an application interface being defined by at least one web document stored on the web server, wherein the at least one web document is a latest version available of the respective web document.

5. Again, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

6. Furthermore, Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

7. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant submits similar arguments for Chang and Evans reference.

As such, Claims 7-12 and 14 stand rejected..